FOIA HEARING STATUS REPORT

CASE NO. 2:24-cv-01589-EJY

31, 2024, (5) days after being served the subpoena.

- 2. The meet-and-confer left both parties at a standstill, as OCR wanted the PLAINTIFF to quash the subpoena and they would slowly produce documents with no guarantee that all documents would be delivered; and the PLAINTIFF, wanted a guarantee all documents contained within OCR case file #10222173 would be produced and delivered within (7) days time, January 6, 2025, as this date put them (12) days out from the date of service. The PLAINTIFF was concerned with receipt of case file documents because she originally submitted a FOIA Request back in July of 2024, that the Department of Education did not respond to until receipt of subpoena in this case.
- 3. NRCP 45(a)(4)(B)(ii) requires that before a party may be protected from the subpoena, "the objecting party must file and serve written objections to the subpoena and a motion for a protective order under Rule 26(c) within 7 days after being served with notice and a copy of the subpoena under Rule 45(a)(4)(A)". Emphasis added. Thus, failure to both object within 7 days and file a motion within 7 days waives the objections and the right to a protective order. Waiver generally applies even if the objection is as to privilege."<sup>2</sup>
- 4. The Department of Education at no point during their (12) day window did they object to subpoena or even hint at Intent to Subpoena as an objection to produce "documents" per instructions of subpoena. However the subpoena served was clearly date stamped by the Deputy Clerk, on December 10, 2024, and the Notice was proof of proper procedure for the State of Nevada per NRCP 45<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Cf. Id. (citing Davis v. Fendler, 650 F.2d 1154, 1160 (9th Cir. 1981) (holding in the context of Rule 33 that a "failure to object" "constitutes waiver of any objection" and "is true even of an objection that the information sought is privileged")).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> NRCP 45(a)(1)(D) authorizes issuance of a subpoena to a non-party to produce evidence independent of any deposition or permit inspection of premises.

- 5. The PLAINTIFF has had to wait (7) months to almost receive 2,266 pages, which constitutes an unknown number of documents, and it is unclear if this is all documentation contained within OCR case #10222173, as the PLAINTIFF has not had those documents made available to her in direct contradiction to the U.S. Attorney's Office Status Report, filed on February 14, 2025, that stated on February 13, 2025, "the Department completed its production of records for FOIA Request No. 24-02735-F, producing an additional 2,266 pages in its response. On that same date, the Department closed FOIA Request No. 24-02735-F"; but no where does it state those documents were made available to the PLAINTIFF.
- 6. On January 6, 2025, after close of business, the PLAINTIFF filed the First Motion to Compel Subpoena Duces Tecum with this Court. Due to a small technicality, PLAINTIFF filed a Second Motion to Compel Subpoena Duces Tecum that remedied the technicality of the First Motion to Compel; and PLAINTIFF respectfully requests You Honor, grant her Second Motion to Compel her subpoena served on OCR as part of the FOIA Hearing, scheduled on February 18, 2025, at 9:30 AM PST.
- 7. The PLAINTIFF objects to the U.S. Attorney's Office representing the Department of Education, a Status Report by the U.S. Attorney's Office, was only filed after the PLAINTIFF emailed all involved parties, including the Magistrate Judge's Clerk, the part of ECF Order 38, which stipulated OCR, DoEd Counsel, and "an appropriate representative of the Department," may appear at the FOIA Hearing. The U.S. Attorney's Office, does not qualify as appropriate representation, and the Department of Education and OCR should be compelled to appear before this Court.

	Case 2:24-cv-01589-RFB-EJY	Document 43	Filed 02/15/25	Page 4 of 5				
	CASE NO. 2:24-cv-01589-EJY							
1	Dated: January 15, 2025 Respectfully Submitted By:							
2		/s/Genay L Amerson Genay L. Amerson						
3		1412 Dragonfly R North Las Vegas,	Lanch Lane					
4		Phone: (213) 359-	-9278					
5		Email: <u>dnpblessin</u> Pro se litigant	<u>igs(w)icioud.com</u>					
6								
7								
8								
9								
10 11								
12								
13								
14								
15								
16								
17								
18								
19								
20								
21								
22								
23								
24								
25								
26								
27		4						
28	FOIA HEARING STATUS REPORT							

	Case 2:24-cv-01589-RFB-EJY	Document 43	Filed 02/15/25	Page 5 of 5				
	CASE NO. 2:24-cv-01589-EJY							
1	Signature of this document certifies that a copy was served to the persons named below on th date and in the manner indicated:							
2								
3	Person Served		Party	<u>Date</u>	Method			
4 5	Karl A. Schweikert Nevada Bar No. 13756, California Bar No.		Las Vegas College, Mikhail Education Corporation, and Peter Mikhail President of	2/15/2025	Electronic			
6	291497 <b>KDH Law</b> 2101 Stone Blvd., Suite 115 West S							
7	CA 95691 916.993.5226 Karl@KDHendrickson.com							
8	LR IA 11-1(b)(2)		Mikhail Education Corporation					
9	Attorney Cody S. Mounteer, Esq. Marquis Aurbach		•					
10	10001 River Run Drive Las Vegas, NV 89145							
11	240 ( 45,000, 1 ( 1 0 0 ) 1 10							
12	SUE FAHAMI							
13	Acting United States Attorney District of Nevada							
14	Nevada Bar Number 14853							
15	SUMMER A. JOHNSON Assistant United States Attorney							
16	501 Las Vegas Blvd. South, Suite 1100							
17	Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Telephone: (702) 388-6336							
18	Facsimile: (702) 388-6787 E-mail: <u>Summer.Johnson@usdoj.gov</u>	<u>/</u>						
19	Attorneys for the United States							
20								
21								
22 23								
24								
25								
26								
27								
28		5						
	FOIA HEARING STATUS REPORT							